



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing behind the scenes parts of his first speech against Catiline. He knocks over a vase, to Terentia's distress: "Iam molestum est", she cries, "oratori nup-sisse". She reads one of a packet of letters and then laments "Quondam litteras amantissimas scripsit; nunc epistolia frigescent. Quodam vas mihi dedit, nunc vas mihi demolitur; quondam fuit maritus, nunc est orator". When Cicero at last enters, she gives him a report from the magister ludi which sets in unfavorable light the performances of their son; the boy has been tardy and absent, and is deficient in various subjects. But to his father's delight the report says he declaims well; he cries "Orator clarissimus olim eris". The boy, who is at home at the time, replies, "Facile est oratorem fieri. Declamatio est facillima". This sounds as if he had been reading modern German opinions of his father's oratory.

Presently L. Piso Frugi and Q. Hortensius enter, and in a very good scene Cicero, much against his will, is induced by Terentia's urgent pleading to betroth his daughter to Piso's son. A false note, however, again creeps in here, for Piso is made to say "*sine dote* (the italics are mine) tuam filiam meo filio posco". Piso and Hortensius withdraw. Terentia sends for Tullia and forces her to consent to the marriage. Piso, his son, and the *signatores* enter, and the formal *sponsio* is made (28-29).

The second scene (32-33) portrays the marriage, the third (34-36) pictures the *deductio*. The archaeological details are sufficiently accurate.

On the whole Miss Paxton is distinctly to be congratulated on her booklet. The second play in particular is well constructed, has many good touches, and ought to prove decidedly instructive wherever carefully performed.

C. K.

ADDRESS TO THE TRUSTEES OF AMHERST COLLEGE BY THE CLASS OF 1885

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4:129 brief reference was made to an Address submitted to the Trustees of Amherst College by the Class of 1885 of that College. During the summer a pamphlet of 80 pages was published, giving the Address in full, together with comments by various newspapers and periodicals on the propositions made by the Class. Another pamphlet of 16 pages gives The Reply of the Trustees to the Class of Eighteen Eighty-five. Our readers will, no doubt, be glad to have more exact knowledge of the whole matter.

The Address was prepared by a Committee of three, consisting of Mr. E. Parmelee Prentice, a lawyer of New York City, Dr. Ellsworth G. Lancaster, President of Olivet College, and Dr. William G. Thayer, Head Master of St. Mark's School, South-boro, Mass.

The Committee throughout urges the Trustees so to act that Amherst shall "take a distinctive public position as a representative of that individual training and general culture which once was the purpose of all American Colleges". Education, runs the argument, is now too largely technical and in the Universities there is far too little personal contact and influence between teacher and student. The great State Universities take students as they pass from the High Schools and at once offer them technical training as a preparation for some professional or commercial career; these universities threaten the supremacy even of the privately endowed college. Thanks to most generous support by friends and alumni some great privately endowed universities can compete with the state universities, "taking students from high schools and graduating them equipped to pursue a technical occupation".

This scheme leaves no place for such a college as Amherst. The high school fits for the university, and the university for the selected calling. Amherst, on the other hand, demands a preparation not within the tendencies of the high school, and gives a course of training which does not fit for, but, on the other hand, postpones, preparation for a calling.

What, then, is to be the future of Amherst? It is without the means necessary to enable it to..... compete with the great universities in their extended fields..... Is there no distinctive field which Amherst may occupy, no demand for an improvement in the quality of instruction which Amherst may supply?

We believe that there is such a field; that there are public services which Amherst may render; that there are already signs of reaction from present conditions, and that no institution can better lead and give form to this reaction than Amherst College.

The popular appraisal of education is commercial—measuring the value of a training by the income it returns—and if every man stand for himself alone, this appraisal may be right. It is in the relation of the individual to the community, however, that this view of educational training breaks down. "There are in this country", said Professor Nelson of Williams College, "no two wants more pressing than a literature of the first rank and statesmen of the first rank. The two go together. Your great statesmen are bred on literature and the historic achievements of mankind..... Those alone have the right to deal with the destinies of humanity who have learned the laws by which humanity has come to its present heritage".

No literature, said De Tocqueville, ought to be more studied in democratic ages than that of the ancients. This, classical training, modified from time to time by demands of modern scholarship, has always been the Amherst course, and the Class of 1885 urge that the College can and should make its work in this field of distinctive value and public importance; that this can be done by raising the standard of work among faculty and students—by getting together at Amherst the best teachers in the country in our chosen field of work and the most serious and able young men to profit by this course of teaching. These three things are the College—the course of instruction, the men who give the course, and the students who receive it.

Amherst has stood for a liberal or classical education—the old-fashioned course—and for many years there was in this respect no difference between Amherst and other institutions of higher education in this country. The value to the public of this training in making statesmen and leaders of public thought is even now unquestioned. It is a training in civics, in the history of government, in the development and significance of institutions, in the meaning of civilization—in brief, a training for public leadership, not personal equipment for a trade.

"The American college", Dr. Woodrow Wilson said, "has played a unique part in American life. . . . It formed men who brought to their tasks an incomparable morale, a capacity that seemed more than individual, a power touched with high ideals. The college has been the seat of ideals. The liberal training which it sought to impart took no thought of any particular profession or business, but was meant to reflect in its few and simple disciplines the image of life and thought. Men were bred by it to no skill or craft or calling; the discipline to which they were subjected had a more general object. It was meant to prepare them for the whole of life, rather than some particular part of it. The ideals which lay at its heart were the general ideals of conduct, of right living and right thinking, which made them aware of a world moralized by principle, and catholic reflection and just feeling, a world not of interest but of ideas. Such impressions, such challenges to a man's spirit, such intimations of privilege and duty, are not to be found in the work of professional and technical schools. They cannot be".

Very few colleges follow this line now—unfortunately few, for the old ideas were not all wrong—but among the few that can find no substitute in technical training for the ideals of the past Amherst has an honorable place. This is the opportunity of the College, to make it its work to give that sound training which fits men to become public leaders. Institutions and governments have a history, and the best statesmanship is that which meets the future with lessons derived from a profound understanding of what has gone before us. Technical education, which, so far as government is concerned, for the most part teaches devices but not principles, which seems to assert that successful business fits for successful statesmanship, proceeds upon the assumption that retrospect is not wise and that in any difficulty we should consider not how we got there but how we can get out, as if, said Edmund Burke, we should "consult our invention and reject our experience". Here, indeed, is to be found one of the causes of the increasing excitability of American politics. Invention is the parent of Utopias, socialism, radicalism of all kinds. Experience is the parent of improvement, progress, conservatism.

It is perhaps unnecessary for the Committee to say that in any teaching of the experience of the race the sciences have a necessary place. None would advocate adoption of the unchanged classical course of fifty years ago. All would agree that some knowledge of science is part of a liberal education, and should be taught at Amherst—at least so far as to enable her graduates to enter the best professional schools. Notwithstanding all this, however, the day of the classics has not yet gone by. Mr. Charles Francis Adams, a quarter of a century ago a leader in the attack upon the old scheme of education, himself recently said that as an essential part of a college course "I would prescribe one of the classic tongues, Greek or Latin, as a compulsory

study to the day of graduation, the one royal road to a knowledge of all that is finest in letters and art".

Upon the specific question which Mr. Adams presents, or even upon the broad question what at the present time should be the general character of classical training, the Committee makes no suggestions. The point which it is now sought to emphasize is that there is a great field which Amherst may occupy, that this field is nothing less than training in public leadership and broad culture. In this instruction, if Amherst makes its position publicly distinctive and different from that occupied by the great universities, she need fear no competition.

The tendency of modern institutions—if we disregard their distractions—is to make breadwinners, to fit men to earn money. State universities are necessarily of this character, and the influence upon all institutions which compete with them is strong. Size itself almost irresistibly drives this way. Back of this modern movement is the notion recently stated by Professor John M. Gillette, an apostle of vocational training—his very language marked by the modern divorce from classical scholarship—that "The assumption of State education is that its training is necessary for citizenship, that is, to be a valid member of society. But since one can be such only as he is able to function in society, that is, work in society, according to its fundamental nature, and since society is essentially specialized and vocational in constitution, it follows that to make citizens in the best sense is to vocationalize them, make them able to further some dominant social interest".

With Professor Gillette's conception of citizenship in the best sense we need not quarrel. None doubt, and at the present time none need emphasize the fact, that the world needs, and must have, engineers, chemists, electricians, biologists; that technical education and trade education are essential to the work of the world; that the vast development of schools and universities in technical lines has been in response to urgent public necessity. For all this we have no unfavorable criticism. The point to be emphasized is that different institutions may well turn their attention in different directions.

The proposition for which Amherst stands is that preparation for some particular part of life does not make better citizens than, in President Wilson's phrase, preparation for the whole of it; that because a man can "function in society" as a craftsman in some trade or technical work he is not thereby made a better leader; that we have already too much of that statesmanship marked by ability "to further some dominant social interest" and too little of that which is "aware of a world moralized by principle, steadied and cleared of many an evil thing by true and catholic reflection and just feeling, a world not of interests but of ideas". Amherst upholds the proposition that for statesmen, leaders of public thought, for literature, indeed for all work which demands culture and breadth of view, nothing can take the place of the classical education; that the duty of institutions of higher education is not wholly performed when the youth of the country are passed from the high schools to the universities to be "vocationalized", but that there is a most important work to be performed by an institution which stands outside this straight line to pecuniary reward; that there is room for at least one great classical college, and we believe for many such. This is the training which Amherst has given, and if now the college

were publicly and definitely to stand forward as an exponent of classical learning in such modified course as modern scholarship may approve, we believe that, with its history, its deserved reputation, and its present position, it can take the place of leadership in this work. This once done, the College will no longer appeal for support solely to its friends, but would have reason to expect the efficient support of all friends of classical education—that is, of the most conservative, thoughtful, and scholarly persons.

Among such persons the desire for sound classical training is frequently expressed. It was but recently that Professor Trent of Columbia said:

"Perhaps in time certain colleges will be able to emphasize to a greater degree the tried classical discipline and to cease to compete with the technical schools. There is room in this huge country for institutions of every kind, and there are still people who would gladly give their children on old-fashioned education, that is, a discipline that has been tested, under teachers convinced of its merits, and not hampered by the necessity of defending it against colleagues who do not believe in it".

That Amherst should abolish its present course leading to the degree of B.S. will probably not be seriously questioned. This was once, and perhaps not long since, a valuable course, but at the present time, in view of the courses of instruction given at such schools as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sheffield Scientific School, Cornell, and many others, it seems to the Committee that young men who desire scientific instruction make a mistake to come to Amherst. That the degree should represent something less than a thorough scientific course of some character, or be used to permit graduation of those who, for one reason or another, do not fulfil the requirements of the arts degree, probably few would justify. Williams College refuses to grant this degree, and we believe that Amherst should do the same. It is to be supposed that this would reduce the number of students very considerably, but the Committee urge that the change is one which is due to the College itself as well as to its students.

On the other hand, the classical field we believe belongs to Amherst. This is the work in which the College may be made a leader. Of course such a position cannot be taken at once. Time is necessary, and it is necessary that in time the College so regulate its affairs that it shall be enabled to give the training in its chosen field better than any other institution. The method by which all this may be accomplished the Committee believes is involved in changes which should be inaugurated as parts of a single well-matured policy.

First: Our faculty must be composed of the best teachers in the country for our chosen course.

Second: The body of students and the purpose and life of the College must be directed toward excellence in scholarship.

The address then discussed (pp. 13-17) the need of a very decided increase in salaries of professors, etc., if there is to be decided improvement in teaching. Next means of improving the quality of scholarship of the students are considered (19-24).

The Address concludes (p. 25) with the following words:

We there urge upon the Trustees:

(1) That the instruction given at Amherst College

be a modified classical course as the meaning of that term has been described;

(2) That the degree of Bachelor of Science be abolished;

(3) That the College adopt the deliberate policy to devote all its means to the indefinite increase of teachers' salaries;

(4) That the number of students attending the College be limited;

(5) That entrance be permitted only by competitive examination.

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS

Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors, translated from the Latin with a Commentary. By Mario Emilio Cosenza. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1910). Pp. xiv + 208. \$1.00.

This will be a welcome addition to the bookshelves of many a classical teacher, whose desire to know the period of the revival of learning is tempered by distance from a large library, or lack of time to seek out the original sources. There are ten of these Letters to (classical) Dead Authors—two to Cicero (*altera mores notat, altera laudat ingenium*: so Petrarch, *Fam.* 24.2), one each to Seneca—who was to Petrarch both Senecas rolled into one—Varro, Quintilian, Livy, Pollio, Horace, Vergil, and Homer. Those to Horace and Vergil are in *asclepiads* and *hexameters* respectively, the rest, of course, in prose. They were composed as a diversion, he tells us in a letter written years afterward: *varietatis studio et amoeno quodam laborum diverticulo* (*Fam.*, l. c.). And again—*Lusi ego cum his magnis ingeniis, temerarie forsitan, sed amanter, sed dolenter*, etc. (*ib.*).

The translation is followed in each case by notes, without which the reader not at home in Petrarch would often grope blindly. These notes contain many translations of parallel or illustrative passages in the correspondence of the poet, or from other writers, classical citations in English, metrical renderings from the Octavia, etc. Finally a brief bibliography points the way to further studies in a field which has many fascinations for the classical scholar.

Petrarch has suffered from the fact that to the multitude he is known only at third or fourth hand in the most accessible books. It is therefore to be hoped that Dr. Cosenza's translation and interpretation of a group of the letters will stimulate many students and teachers of the Classics and of modern literature to read and reread the original. Naturally there is much that no translator can reproduce; not that Petrarch's form was of a classical perfection, but because his style so strangely combined naïveté with rhetorical artifice. And though he preferred the rounded periods of Cicero, the sententiousness of a Seneca or Tacitus often appears, even in the same sentence. Such a style